

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1172/01 3521538
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 181538Z DEC 09 ZDK
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0705
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5781
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 2960
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 1970
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7177

S E C R E T GENEVA 001172

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/17/2019
TAGS: [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#) [START](#)
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING
GROUP MEETING, DECEMBER 12, 2009

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-130.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: December 12, 2009
Time: 10:00 A.M. - 11:45 A.M.
Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

¶3. (S) The Memorandum of Understanding Working Group (MOUWG) chairs, Mr. Trout and Gen Orlov, met at the U.S. Mission on December 12. Orlov brought two main topics for discussion, the first regarding data exchange and the second regarding START Annex J. Orlov presented the new Russian proposal regarding data exchange. Trout and Orlov discussed a path forward for working Annex J with Trout agreeing that he needed to discuss the issue with the Inspection Protocol Working Group (IPWG). End Summary.

¶4. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: The Data Exchange; START Annex J; Site Diagram Exchange; and Closing Comments.

THE DATA EXCHANGE

¶5. (S) Orlov began the meeting discussing the new Russian proposal regarding data exchange. First, at the date of

signature, no actual numerical data would be included in the database, only the categories would be listed. Second, within 45 days after signature, the Parties would exchange data current as of July 1, 2009, using the new counting rules for the treaty. Data that was not releasable to the public would not be exchanged. Finally, within 45 days (later changed to 30 days) after entry-into-force (EIF) of the treaty, the Parties would exchange all data current as of the date of EIF.

¶16. (S) Trout reiterated the U.S. proposal regarding data exchange. First, at the date of signature, numerical data would be included in the database using data from the July 1, 2009, START MOU exchange. Data that was not releasable to the public would not be exchanged. Second, within 45 days after signature, the Parties would exchange data current as of the date of signature. Again, data that was not releasable to the public would not be exchanged. Finally, within 30 days after EIF, the Parties would exchange all data current as of that date.

¶17. (S) Orlov again asked what the purpose was for including data at the date of signature. He argued that at the Presidential level these numbers did not matter; only the categories were important. Trout countered saying that the Presidents needed this data to know the full scope of the treaty they were signing.

START ANNEX J

¶18. (S) Orlov then continued to his other topic for conversation, the former START Annex J. After thinking about this last night, he commented, he believed that that the two delegations should appoint one individual on each side to work this document to a reasonable stage and then present it to the working group. His candidate on the Russian side for this task was Col Kamenskiy.

¶19. (S) Trout pointed out that the United States had broken this Annex into smaller parts and moved these parts to different sections related to inspection activities. While both Orlov and Trout agreed the IPWG had a significant amount of work to do, and that it would be beneficial for the MOUWG to work Annex J, Trout pointed out that at this point there was nothing left of the original document to work. Trout added, however, that he needed to discuss this issue with Dr. Warner and would provide a response soon on how to proceed.

SITE DIAGRAM EXCHANGE

¶10. (S) In response to one of the areas of data that would not be exchanged within 45 days after signature, Trout questioned Orlov as to why the Russian side did not want to provide site diagrams prior to EIF, as was done in START. Orlov said that Russia would provide new site diagrams for all its facilities because no one would want 15-year old site diagrams. Kamenskiy commented that the Russian side would probably amend or change some site diagrams but others may not change from those used in START. Trout responded to this with two points. First, the Senate needed to have site diagrams in the ratification process to help them understand how the treaty would be verifiable. When Orlov countered that the United States could use existing START diagrams to give to the Senate, Trout followed up with his second point, stating that if the purpose of exchanging site diagrams for the ratification process was to help in showing how the treaty was verifiable, it was not logical to give old site diagrams because so many of them might change after EIF.

¶11. (S) Orlov commented that the Senate and Duma would not care about this level of detail, and even if they did, he continued, it is our job to argue our logic to them.

Kamenskiy pointed out that the Parties had site diagrams for the duration of START and this history of what is the inspectable area has not disappeared. Each Party, he argued, has a "general vision" of what will be inspectable, and even if the site diagrams changed a little it would not be anything dramatic. Orlov reiterated that site diagrams were not a strategic issue, commenting that nobody at the Senate level will even look at these documents.

¶12. (S) Trout countered this argument, again stating that these site diagrams were important documents, that they needed to be current and accurate in relation to what will be used in the new treaty, and that they needed to be part of the ratification process.

CLOSING COMMENTS

¶13. (S) Trout closed the meeting stating that he would take the Russian proposal regarding data exchange back to his delegation, and to Washington, and would provide a response the same day or the next morning. Trout also agreed that he would discuss the Annex J issues with Dr. Warner to decide what should happen.

¶14. (U) Documents provided: None.

¶15. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES:

Mr. Trout
LT Lobner
Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA:

Gen Orlov
Col Pischulov
Col Kamensky
Ms. Evarovskaya (Int)

¶16. (U) Gottemoeller sends.
GRIFFITHS